

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

In the Office Action at item 3, the Examiner objected Figures 7-9, as indicated therein. In order to overcome the objection to FIG. 9, one replacement sheet for FIG. 9 is submitted herewith, according to which FIG. 9 is designated as "PRIOR ART." Approval and entry of the changes to the drawings is respectfully requested. Withdrawal of the objection to FIG. 9 is respectfully requested.

The objections to FIG. 7-8 are traversed as discussed in the remarks herein.

**REMARKS**

**STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-9 are rejected.

The claims are amended according to the foregoing and as discussed herein, and, thus, claims 1-9 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

In the Office Action at item 3, the Examiner objected Figures 7-9, as indicated therein. In order to overcome the objection to FIG. 9, one replacement sheet for FIG. 9 is submitted herewith, according to which FIG. 9 is designated as "PRIOR ART." Approval and entry of the changes to the drawings is respectfully requested. Withdrawal of the objection to FIG. 9 is respectfully requested.

Regarding FIGS. 7-8, the Applicant respectfully disagree with the Examiner that these figures should be labeled as --PRIOR ART--, because FIGS. 7-8 are diagrams of a system in which the claimed present invention is embodied and implemented, as discussed, for example, in FIGS. 1-5 and page 12, lines 9-12 of the present Application, and as such would not be prior art. Withdrawal of the objection to FIGS. 7-8 is respectfully requested.

**REJECTIONS**

Claim 4 is rejected for indefiniteness by not reciting proper antecedent basis for "the server." Claim 4 is amended taking into consideration the Examiner's comments.

Claims 1-5, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Walker et al. (US Patent No. 6,390,917). Walker is newly cited, and, thus newly relied upon.

Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker. Page 5, item 11, of the Office Action.

The independent claims are 1, 3, 4 and 9.

The independent claims, using claims 1 and 4 as examples, are amended as follows:

1. (currently amended) A client/server system comprising:
  - a server, comprising:
    - software to generate operating instructions for a client-side I/O device;
    - a device driver to generate a control signal for the client-side I/O device based on the operating instructions; and
    - a virtual I/O port to directly transmit the control signal for the client-side I/O device and to directly receive an I/O event from the client-side I/O device, to directly control the client-side I/O device; and
  - a client in communication with the client-side I/O device, comprising:
    - a device handler to directly receive from the server the control signal from the virtual I/O port in the server, to control the client-side I/O device based upon system resources in the server ~~on the control signal received from the virtual I/O port in the server~~, and to directly transmit the I/O event received from the client-side I/O device to the virtual I/O port in the server.
4. (currently amended) A client, comprising:
  - a device handler to control a client-side I/O device coupled with the client based on a control signal directly received from a virtual I/O port on ~~the a~~ a server based upon system resources in the server, the control signal generated by a device driver in the server based on operating instructions generated by software on the server, and to directly transmit an I/O event received from the client-side I/O device to the virtual I/O port in the server.

Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, in FIGS. 1, 3 and 4, and page 5 and the paragraph spanning pages 16-17 of the present Application.

Walker discloses a client “Slot machine 14 is configured in a manner known in the prior art, except for the inclusion of an interactive display device 22 and a display device control subroutine 50” (Walker, column 4, lines 53-56). Walker’s slot machine 14 (FIG. 6) provides:

Display control subroutine 50 is called into action when a product/product purchase advertising message is received from network server 12 to enable display of the message by display 54. Further, ***display control procedure 50 controls the operation of interactive display module 22***, including display 54, card

reader 55 and keys 56. When a player inputs a selection or other data via keys 56, such an entry is recognized by display control procedure 50, which causes the resident CPU in slot machine 14 to configure the entered data for transmission over bus system 20 (via the slot/network server interface) to network server 12” (Walker, column 5, lines 1-11, FIG. 6, emphasis added)

In other words, the client/slot machine 14 contains a subroutine that controls the interactive display device 22, thereby using the client system’s resources (e.g., CPU) to control the interactive display device 22. In Walker, the display control subroutine 50 would be capable of receiving commands and advertisement data from a server, however, as discussed above, ***the client’s “display control procedure 50 controls the operation of [the] interactive display module 22”*** via the CPU (Walker, column 4, lines 52-67; column 5, lines 1-11 and FIG. 6).

A benefit of the claimed present invention is that “the client can eliminate an arrangement for controlling the I/O device to mitigate the hardware resources in the client ***since the server directly controls the I/O device***” (see present specification, page 5 lines 23-26). Thus, because Walker discusses that the client’s CPU executes the interactive display module 50 based upon instructions from a server, Walker fails to teach or suggest the claimed present invention’s, “a client in communication with the client-side I/O device, comprising: ***a device handler to directly receive from the server the control signal from the virtual I/O port in the server, to control the client-side I/O device based upon system resources in the server on the control signal received from the virtual I/O port in the server, and to directly transmit the I/O event received from the client-side I/O device to the virtual I/O port in the server***” (e.g., claim 1). In other words, contrary to the Office Action rejection rationale in page 4, item 9, Walker’s display control subroutine 50 differs from the claimed present invention’s, client “device handler,” which can “***directly receive from the server the control signal from the virtual I/O port in the server, to control the client-side I/O device based upon system resources in the server, and to directly transmit the I/O event received from the client-side I/O device to the virtual I/O port in the server***.” Further, it is readily apparent that Walker’s display control subroutine 50 fails to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention’s, “***client ... device handler ... to directly transmit the I/O event received from the client-side I/O device to the virtual I/O port in the server***.” Thus, in a non-limiting example, the claimed present invention’s server and client allowing the server to directly control a client-side I/O device would eliminate the need for the “display device control subroutine 50 contained within a resident storage device

53" of Walker, thereby reducing hardware resources of the client, freeing client system resources, and reducing hardware costs by reducing hardware in the client used to control the I/O device. Support for the claimed present invention can be found, for example, in pages 14-17 of the present Application.

Therefore, Walker fails to expressly, impliedly or inherently anticipate the claimed present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 3, 4 and 9. The dependent claims 6-8 recite patentably distinguishing features of their own and are also at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims.


### **CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 15, 2005

By:   
Mehdi D. Sheikerz  
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501